

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 21, 2004. Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-20 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, and 19 are in independent form. Claims 1, 5, 10, 14, and 19 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, and Claim 11 has been amended in a minor formal respect. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,509 (*Alcorn*).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 19 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is an image processing apparatus. The apparatus includes an input unit, a discriminator, and first and second determiners. The input unit inputs a rendering command. The discriminator discriminates a type of object to be rendered on the basis of the rendering command input by the input unit. The first determiner determines whether the object is to be subjected to a correction process, in accordance with the result discriminated by the discriminator, and the second determiner determines whether the object which is determined to be subjected to the correction process is an object segmented from an image or not, by examining a rendering region of the object and neighboring regions thereof.

Among other important features recited in Claim 1 is the determination of whether an object is segmented from an image by examining a rendering region of the object and neighboring regions thereof. By virtue of this feature, the object is suitably rendered. For example, an object 2-C, shown in Figure 2, is determined by examining neighboring regions which include objects 2-A, 2-B, 2-D, and 2-E, of a rendering region of the object 2-C.¹

Alcorn relates to texture mapping and discusses that an object to be mapped is segmented into primitives, such as triangles, as depicted in Fig. 5. Apical coordinates and color information of the triangles are converted to perform the texture mapping.

As noted by the Examiner, *Alcorn* discusses that when a primitive extends beyond a view volume represented on a display screen, view clipping is executed to ensure an accurate screen display of the resulting image. The Examiner also states at page 5 of the Office Action that the vertices of each triangle primitive are parts of an object segmented from an image. Applicant understands the Examiner's comments at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action to be that an object is segmented from an image if an extended object is within the view volume, but that the object is not segmented from an image if a portion of the extended object protrudes from the view volume. Thus, if a rendering region of an object is in the view volume, the determination defined by the Examiner is executed based on a correspondence of an extended object and the rendering region of the object. However, the invention as defined by Claim 1 does not extend an object and does not execute the determination based on the above correspondence defined by the Examiner. Accordingly, nothing has been found in *Alcorn* that would teach or

¹It is to be understood, of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the described embodiments, which are referred to only to facilitate explanation.

suggest determining whether an object is segmented from an image by examining a rendering region of the object and neighboring regions thereof, as recited in Claim 1.

For at least the above reason, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over *Alcorn*.

Independent Claims 10 and 19 are method and computer program product claims respectively corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over *Alcorn* for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald A. Clayton", written over a horizontal line.

Ronald A. Clayton
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 26,718

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200